DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 474 32 EA 003 707

AUTHOR Webb, Harold H.
TITLE North Carolina Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1970: Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 - Title I.
INSTITUTION North Carolina State Board of Education, Raleigh. Dept. of Public Instruction.
PUB DATE Dec 70
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence and (2) applicable supplementary or background information. Data were collected from the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, and State ESEA Title I personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (EA)

ED053474

EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NORTH CAROLINA TITLE I EVALUATION REPORT FISCAL YEAR 1970

Elementary & Secondary Education Act of 1965

PREPARED BY
THE STATE ADMINISTRATION, TITLE I, ESEA
HAROLD H. WEBB, COORDINATOR
A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, STATE SUPERINTENDENT
STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

EA 003 707

ED053474

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - Title I

North Carolina Evaluation Report

Fiscal Year 1970

Prepared by
The State Administration, Title I, ESEA
Harold H. Webb, Coordinator
A. Craig Phillips, State Superintendent
Raleigh, North Carolina
December, 1970

North Carolina Annual Evaluation Report for

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1970

Flementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - Title I

1. Provide the following basic State statistics:
(Data secured from preliminary evaluation reports submitted by each LEA.)

A.	Total number of operating LEAs in the State	152
B.	Number of LEAs participating in Title I	152
	(1) during the regular school term only.	9
	(2) during the summer term only.	1
	(3) during both the regular school term and the summer term.	143
C.	Number of Title I projects.	151
D.	Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs.	
	(1) enrolled in public schools	259,120
	(2) enrolled in non-public schools	1,462

Operation. Of the 216 staff visits, 76, or 30 percent, were for the purpose of reviewing the operation of the Title I project. Most often these visits consisted of on-site visits to view the various aspects of the project which were operating satisfactorily and those which were not. On the basis of such observations, recommendations for improvement were then made. Recommendations frequently made included the following: more inservice training for teachers, planned visitation of nearby Title I projects judged to be successful, more widespread dissemination of information gleaned from the project evaluation, a constant review of alternative ways of attacking educational problems, and careful consideration of the equipment and/or technique which might be utilized. It was generally recognized by both the LEA and the State staff that on-site visits were mutually beneficial.

Evaluation. Of the 216 staff visits, 26, or 12 percent, were devoted to project evaluation. The major objective of these visits was to improve the evaluation procedure utilized by the LEA. In several instances, visits were required to assure that accurate data would be secured from the "Elementary School Survey" and the "Consolidated Program Information Report." In other instances the visit focused on the effective reporting of local evaluation materials, and the use of such materials in project planning and development. Based on comments from the State staff, these visits and the resulting frank appraisal often resulted in positive changes in project emphasis.

In addition, the State evaluation staff conducted 5 area evaluation meetings for the purpose of discussing the 1970 "Elementary School Survey." Representatives from 18 LEAs attended these meetings and later participated in the survey.

2. During FY 1970, indicate the number of SEA Title I staff visits to LEAs participating in Title I. By objective of visit (planning, program development, program operation, evaluation, etc.), specify the purposes of these visits and their effect on the development, operation, and evaluation of local projects. Indicate proportion of visits, by type.

During FY 1970 the State Title I staff made 216 visits to LEAs participating in Title 1. These staff visits can be categorized by objective as follows: (1) planning, (2) development, (3) operation, (4) evaluation, and (5) other.

Planning. Of the 216 staff visits, 45, or 21 percent, were primarily devoted to assisting the LEA to plan effective projects. Through such visits the State staff assisted the local staff in such areas as identifying needs, defining objectives, determining appropriate activities, and selecting alternatives which offer greater promise of helping the target population.

In addition to these visits, the SEA staff conducted 5 area meetings as a means of assisting LEAs to plan project proposals. Many LEA project directors also visited the State office to secure help in planning.

Development. Of the 216 staff visits, 43, or 20 percent, were primarily focused on program development. Through these visits the Title I staff assisted the LEAs to complete the planning process and to develop project proposals in a format which could be easily reviewed for approval. Also, in these visits, the staff suggested new or alternative approaches to the solution of stated problems. Frequently, too, the staff member found it necessary to encourage the LEA to concentrate upon a limited number of activities rather than attempting to implement a large number of separate activities. From time to time the staff also found it necessary to reemphasize that Title I activities must focus upon specific student needs rather than upon general school needs.

Other Visits. Of the 216 staff visits, 26, or approximately 12 percent, did not easily fit into the four categories above. These included activities such as laying the groundwork for the development of future programs, investigation of complaints, providing assistance in special problem areas, collecting data for dissemination, and delivering speeches or talks to teacher and/or parent groups. It is believed that, although not considered planning sessions, these visits will later result in more formal planning of new and/or revised activities.

3. Describe any changes your agency has made in the last three years in its procedures and the effect of such changes to:
   A. improve the quality of Title I projects
   B. insure proper participation of non-public school children
   C. modify local projects in the light of State and local evaluation

A. Each Title I staff member, in addition to his specialty, (evaluation, project control, coordination of Title I with other programs, etc.) also serves as a Title I consultant to a group of LEAs. As part of his responsibility each member of the State Title I staff visits the projects assigned to him. During the on-site visit the staff member compares the project proposal and the operation of the project, and reviews the efforts made to attain the objectives of the project. He notes and points out to the LEA superintendent and Title I director the strengths and weaknesses observed, and makes both short-term and long-range suggestions relative to the project. He also shares ideas gleaned from other projects.

This personal contact is useful both to the local and the State staff. The LEA is now more likely to request development and planning assistance from the State office. Likewise, the LEA is more receptive to suggested revisions, and will frequently visit the State office to secure information or seek assistance in a special area. Also, the arrangement provides the State office with an effective mechanism for securing and reviewing statistical and evaluation information from the LEAs.

B. The local Title I director was charged with the responsibility of contacting officials of non-public schools in their district, explaining the Title I program, and encouraging participation to the extent permitted under regulations. Each of the LEAs which had non-public schools in its district included as part of its project proposal a response to the following statement:

> "Educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools will have genuine opportunities to participate in the Title I program on the basis of need as determined by the comprehensive assessment of the needs of all children in the eligible low-income areas. The high priority needs of private school children residing in those areas will be met with services that are comparable in scope and quality to those provided to meet the high priority needs of public school children."

The State staff, as part of its responsibility, encouraged the LEA to extend services to eligible non-public schools, and to design cooperatively Title I activities for eligible non-public school children. However, the number of non-public school students who participated in the Title I program was small, since the State has a relatively small number of children enrolled in such schools.

C. The study of State and local Title I evaluation reports resulted in efforts by both the SEA and the LEAs to modify local projects. Some general outcomes included the following:

- increased effort to design activities to meet the most pressing needs of the eligible children
- greater effort to design programs which offer specific rather than general types of assistance (a special reading teacher rather than reducing teacher load by 3 students, for example)
- greater use of prior evaluations in the planning of programs
- increased effort to coordinate Title I activities with overall school program

Because of the extremely wide range of needs of the Title I eligible

children, it has become evident that some needs must be given priority over other needs. On the basis of what has been learned through the operation and the evaluation of the Title I program thus far, the State staff has determined that the following activities should have the highest priority:

- Summer programs
- Early childhood education
- Lower elementary grade education
- Expanded inservice programs
- Parental involvement
- Evaluation
- Developmental activities (as opposed to remedial)
- Community services.

Likewise, the following activities should have the lowest priority:

- Equipment
- Programs already substantially supported by Federal, State, or local effort
- Construction
- Secondary school activities
- Cultural activities in regular session for large groups of students.

4. Effect Upon Educational Achievement

A. What effect, if any, has Title I had upon the educational achievement of educationally deprived children, including those children in non-public schools in your state?

Tables I through IV, an aggregation of the most commonly used reading tests in the state, should show a status report of Title I eligible children in the area of reading. The emphasis on reading improvement is found in a vast majority of Title I projects. Mean scores for 73,457 children are reflected in the tables, as well as the distributions by quartile ranges (with the first decile separated). Scores for educationally disadvantaged students in non-public schools have not been reported separately. Norms are national or publishers' norms for the respective tests. There are no current North Carolina state norms for the total school population.

It is hypothesized that a comparison of mean scores by grade on the reading subtests for 1970 would reflect an appreciable change upward in nearly all grade levels in a period of 5 years. This change did occur in 5 of 10 grades with the California Reading Test, the change was insignificant at grade 9, and the change was in a negative direction in grades 4, 5, 7, and 8 (Table I). The change was upward with the Metropolitan Reading subtest for all 8 grades reported, except grade 4 (Table III). The range of improvement was from .3 to 8.2 months. This test accounted for nearly one-third of all reading subtest scores reported.

The Stanford Achievement Paragraph Meaning subtest mean scores by grade, when compared with results for 1968 shows improvement for 6 of the 9 grades reported (from .3 months to 1 year .3 months), while a decline of from .7 to 1.4 months is noted for grades 2, 3, and 5, respectively. Admittedly, the downward difference is small. If mean scores

are compared for 1966 for this test, the first 4 grades would show some improvement, while the next 4 grades would reflect a decrease.

Comparable data for 1966 for the Gates - MacGinitie Test are not available (Table II).

An examination of the change in the percent of students falling in the quartile ranges may also reflect a long range change (using 1966 as a base). This is not shown to an appreciable extent. For instance, in the Metropolitan Reading subtest there is a difference of 1.3 percent, (43.3 to 42.0) grades K-8, falling in the first quartile. This very slight shift moves up to the fourth quartile. This is a difficult comparison to make with the various tests, since the percentile tables are not uniformly designed for the several tests.

A number of factors influence the outcome of an analysis such as the preceding: (1) the samples are unstructured; (2) numbers compared are not identical from year to year; (3) students may or may not be tested in certain grade levels from year to year; (4) testing programs and patterns change; (5) there have been massive shifts of student population and school organization this year, particularly; (6) dates on times of testing vary among LEAs; (7) administration of tests may be loose and unsophisticated in some LEAs; (8) there is great variation in the amount, quality, and kind of direct and supportive compensatory "treatment" that beneficiaries have received; (9) the practice of reporting test results for all children in target schools has shifted to reporting those for actual Title I participants. These factors are cited to suggest the effects that they undoubtedly have on the validity and reliability of the foregoing results, and particularly of any comparisons which may be made which are based on them. Every effort has been made to eliminate or correct reports

which are obviously invalid. The scores reported do indicate to some degree the status of educationally disadvantaged children in the State.

Three Tables of pre-post test results (V - VII) during the 1970 fiscal year are presented to show the reading improvement made by Title I beneficiaries, and these would constitute a relatively valid measure of their growth in reading during the year.

On the California Reading Test, students in grades 1-10 showed gains in reading scores from pre to post test of 4 months to 1 year per grade in an interval of 7 to 9 months, with an average gain per grade of 6.5 months.

On the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, students in grades 1-9 showed gains in reading scores on pre and post tests of 5 months to 1 year and 7 months per grade, with an average gain per grade of 8 months.

On the Paragraph Meaning subtest of the Stanford Achievement Battery, students in grades 2-10 showed gains of 1 month to 2 years 2 months per grade, or an average gain per grade of 7.2 months.

Since the testing interval for the pre-post reading tests varied from 7 to 9 months, the gains reported appear to be creditable.

The area of language arts is emphasized in many Title I projects. One Table (VIII) is included to show the status of this effort. On the California Achievement Test, Total Language, mean end of year scores by grade are compared with those for 1966. There is an improvement reflected for all grades 1-9, except for grades 4 and 5, which are lower. The improvement is from 1 month to 1 year 5 months. In this table also the percent of students falling in the first quartile is about 25 percent, and the percent of students falling in the 50th percentile and below is less than 50 percent (48.2). This appears encouraging.

Summer schools generally achieved good results, some excellent. For example, McDowell County showed pre-post gains in reading of 4-7 months in a interval of 1 month, as evidenced by their test reports.

Other summer programs achieving creditable test gains were Union County, Mooresville City, Montgomery County, Carteret County, Kannapolis City, Henderson County, Cumberland County, Randolph County, Asheboro City, and Eden City.

Some of the kindergarten academic year programs are worthy of note. Hickory City achieved a mean score at the 48th percentile with 180 kindergarten children tested with the Metropolitan Readiness Test. Rutherford County did almost as well, the kindergarten children scored at the 42 percentile level on the same test, and raised their i.q.; average by 12 points (205 children). Catawba County, Kinston City, and Burke County showed significant achievement in kindergarten results.

Table I

California Achievement Battery
Total Reading-Title I Eligible Students
April, May, FY 1970

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Mean*	Mean FY66	Difference	Number of Students in Percentile Ranges				
							1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
6	8	1	932	1.66	1.53	.13	240	147	189	122	234
20	78	2	3078	2.43	2.26	.17	363	506	650	542	1017
17	71	3	2290	3.41	3.11	.30	296	341	586	392	675
22	91	4	2771	4.32	4.69	-.37	282	489	769	596	635
18	67	5	1656	4.97	5.43	-.46	274	325	457	332	268
21	76	6	3384	5.71	5.33	.38	766	607	840	574	597
14	45	7	2111	7.00	7.36	-.36	261	434	558	428	430
12	31	8	1159	7.36	7.82	-.46	300	224	224	171	240
8	13	9	1464	8.63	8.62	.01	203	221	327	347	366
7	9	10	615	9.40	8.00	1.40	72	155	204	98	86
TOTAL			19,460				3057	3449	4804	3602	4548
						PERCENT	15.7	17.7	24.7	18.5	23.4

*Grade Equivalent Units

North Carolina 043

Table II

Gates MacGinitie Reading Test (Comprehension)
Administered Spring (April, May) 1970
Title I Eligible Students

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Mean*	Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
2	11	1	537	1.60	132	117	139	85	64
6	36	2	1013	2.41	227	232	243	167	144
7	38	3	1092	3.21	177	263	310	237	105
8	38	4	804	3.85	198	193	213	114	86
6	28	5	294	4.63	50	75	87	57	25
5	25	6	249	5.65	20	70	86	45	28
3	5	7	108	6.52	33	19	36	19	1
4	7	8	771	7.47	60	98	193	216	204
TOTAL			4868		897	1067	1307	940	657
				PERCENT	18.4	21.9	26.8	19.3	13.5

*Grade Equivalent Units

Table III

Metropolitan Achievement Tests
Reading Readiness-Reading
Title I Eligible Students-April-May, FY 1970

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Mean*	Mean FY66	Difference	Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
9	41	K	1339	16-48**			151	302	378	305	203
14	93	1	3294	1.86	1.83	.03	468	750	828	539	709
16	77	2	2362	2.73	2.68	.05	382	443	601	388	548
18	120	3	3976	3.51	3.41	.10	548	983	1157	746	542
16	71	4	2540	4.09	4.20	-.10	489	680	698	406	267
14	88	5	2860	4.98	4.59	.39	613	727	776	405	339
12	66	6	2981	5.88	5.79	.09	682	713	732	500	354
10	67	7	2496	6.33	5.51	.82	670	577	598	328	323
9	47	8	2254	7.07	6.93	.14	529	422	602	325	376
TOTAL			24,102				4532	5597	6370	3942	3661
						PERCENT	18.8	23.2	26.4	16.4	15.2

*Grade Equivalent Units
**Mean Percentile Range Among LEAs

North Carolina 043

Table IV

Stanford Achievement Battery-Paragraph Meaning
Title I Eligible Students
April, May, FY 1970

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Mean*	Mean FY68	Difference	Number of Students in Percentile Ranges				
							1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
10	31	1	1446	1.82	1.72	+.10	293	278	329	130	416
17	70	2	3137	2.31	2.38	-.07	615	657	753	620	492
19	83	3	3325	2.87	2.95	-.08	1010	789	838	430	258
20	100	4	3596	3.83	3.80	+.03	935	894	972	470	325
19	80	5	3268	4.56	4.70	-.14	686	839	869	502	372
19	84	6	3322	5.48	5.35	+.13	776	730	895	509	412
16	52	7	3034	6.14	5.98	+.16	674	789	780	414	377
15	50	8	2520	7.10	6.85	+.25	658	558	543	400	361
3	5	9	507	7.05	6.02	+1.03	191	155	78	57	26
2	4	10	373	6.11			120	125	73	36	19
1	3	11	252	8.40			44	63	76	39	30
1	3	12	247	8.50			37	60	80	40	30
TOTAL			25,027				6039	5937	6286	3647	3118
						PERCENT	24.1	23.7	25.1	14.6	12.5

*Grade Equivalent Units

North Carolina 043

Table V

California Achievement Battery
Pre Test-Post Test Total Reading-Title I Eligible Students
Sept., Oct.--April, May FY 1970

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Pre* Mean	Post Mean	Difference	PRETEST Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	25-50	51-75	76-99	POST TEST Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
1	3	1	40	0.50	1.50	+1.00	19	10	7	2	2	2	6	1	10	21
8	22	2	622	1.47	2.26	+ .79	437	83	50	30	22	150	111	126	91	144
8	28	3	454	2.37	3.04	+ .67	153	94	109	68	30	82	83	80	88	121
10	39	4	720	3.14	3.78	+ .64	219	252	175	34	40	93	174	228	135	90
8	32	5	541	4.02	4.74	+ .72	164	154	152	43	28	109	143	178	77	34
9	28	6	550	4.90	5.44	+ .54	197	157	138	34	24	169	129	161	58	33
5	16	7	592	6.11	6.80	+ .69	128	145	187	47	85	119	149	171	57	96
4	12	8	486	7.15	7.58	+ .43	118	103	125	64	76	135	102	96	65	88
2	2	9	78	6.50	6.89	+ .39	61	13	4			38	19	12	8	1
1	1	10	31	6.90	7.50	+ .60		14	17			21	8	2		
TOTAL 56	183		4,114				1,496	1,025	964	322	307	918	924	1055	589	628

*Grade Equivalent Units

North Carolina 043

Table VI

Gates MacGinitie Reading Test (Comprehension)
Pre and Post Tests, Sept., Oct.-April, May, FY 1970
Title I Eligible Students
(Mean Scores in Grade Equivalent Units)

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	*Pre Mean	Post Mean	Difference	PRETEST Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	25-50	51-75	76-99	POST TEST Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
4	21	2	476	1.84	2.34	.50	141	134	148	32	21	94	134	119	81	48
6	30	3	559	2.07	3.13	1.06	213	195	123	28		65	161	161	136	36
6	22	4	298	2.86	3.69	.83	100	123	51	22	2	77	97	85	28	11
5	20	5	205	3.84	4.60	.76	53	77	54	17	4	46	60	61	28	10
4	18	6	166	5.00	5.78	.78	27	66	49	15	9	16	54	62	21	13
3	5	7	108	5.42	6.52	1.10	46	26	24	11	1	33	19	36	19	1
3	6	8	761	6.23	7.49	1.26	88	122	206	166	179	55	105	185	215	201
1	1	9	38	6.5	8.20	1.70	9	22	5	2		4	14	14	6	
TOTAL			2611				677	765	660	293	216	390	644	723	534	320
PERCENT							25.9	29.3	25.3	11.2	8.3	14.9	24.6	27.7	20.5	12.3

*Mean Scores in Grade Equivalent Units

Table VII

Stanford Achievement Battery-Paragraph Meaning
Pre and Post Tests, Title I Eligible Students
Sept., Oct.--April, May, FY 1970

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Pre* Mean	Post Mean	Difference	PRETEST Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	25-50	51-75	76-99	POST TEST Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
3	11	2	475	1.67	2.28	.61	308	66	60	10	31	136	105	111	48	75
5	14	3	543	2.07	2.92	.85	373	93	54	18	5	205	155	98	63	22
5	19	4	602	2.82	3.57	.75	154	176	234	33	5	124	114	248	75	41
7	18	5	706	3.43	4.21	.78	299	208	151	30	18	164	206	235	79	22
7	23	6	826	4.30	5.12	.82	325	216	227	46	12	241	221	256	83	25
7	15	7	928	5.20	5.79	.59	293	390	171	51	23	306	292	247	48	35
6	15	8	668	5.89	6.43	.54	280	216	102	39	31	295	187	100	57	29
2	3	9	110	6.13	8.30	2.17	40	25	25	19	1	31	26	18	18	17
1	1	10	11	6.50	6.60	.10	5	3	1	2		4	3	4		
TOTAL			4869				2077	1393	1025	248	126	1506	1309	1317	471	266
PERCENT			100				42.7	28.6	21.0	5.1	2.6	30.9	26.9	27.0	9.7	5.4

*Grade Equivalent Units

North Carolina 043

Table VIII

California Achievement Tests
Total Language
Title I Eligible Students
April-May, FY 1970

No. LEAs	No. Schools	Grade	N	Mean*	Mean FY 66	Difference	Number of Students in Percentile Ranges 1-10	11-25	26-50	51-75	76-99
1	1	1	73	2.50	1.67	+.83	9	3	7	6	48
3	16	2	989	2.60	2.32	+.28	95	141	236	217	300
3	20	3	1017	3.60	3.47	+.13	83	139	197	194	404
4	21	4	1026	4.62	4.87	-.25	93	175	239	251	268
5	10	5	312	5.05	5.22	-.17	30	45	71	76	90
4	25	6	1584	6.19	5.57	+.62	256	260	361	326	381
2	8	7	923	7.72	7.13	+.59	90	132	229	235	237
4	8	9	1097	9.27	7.72	+1.55	96	144	251	267	339
TOTAL			7021				752	1039	1591	1572	2067
						PERCENT	10.7	14.8	22.7	224	29.4

*Mean Score in Grade Equivalent Units

B. What are the common characteristics of those Title I projects in your State that are most effective in improving educational achievement?

The Title I projects in North Carolina which were considered to be most effective by the State staff usually possessed several common characteristics. This group of projects were, first of all, carefully planned to achieve a limited number of specific objectives. Usually these projects contained a limited number of activities. Generally, the more effective projects concentrated upon the elementary school level rather than upon the secondary level.

The more effective educational activities were those which emphasized developmental rather than remedial goals. Small group instruction by special teachers generally achieved more positive results than regular class instruction by the regular teacher. To be effective, however, most activities required a greater variety of instructional materials than were available from regular sources. Also important was the question of coordination of the Title I program with the regular instructional program. Generally, the more effective projects were able to achieve this coordination. Although the more effective projects had a limited number of activities funded under Title I, there usually were some supportive services funded as a means of assuring that those social, cultural, and health weaknesses contributing to educational deprivation could also be attacked.

The more successful projects also made greater effort to involve the community and the school in the identification of needs as well as in the planning of the project. Where such cooperation was present, and where well-prepared, sympathetic teachers focused their attention on the needs of target children, success resulted. A final comment relative to the more effective project also relates to the preparation of teachers for the special tasks assigned them. Most of the more successful projects had an

inservice education component. In some instances this component has made it possible for a mediocre project to become a good project.

C. What evidence, if any, have you found in your State that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to cost?

None of the Title I evaluation studies completed in North Carolina related the effectiveness of Title I projects to the cost of the projects. The data submitted to the State Title I office therefore cannot be used in any objective manner to draw a conclusion relative to cost effectiveness.

5. What effect, if any, has the Title I program had on the administrative structure and educational practices of your State Education Agency, Local Education Agencies, and non-public schools?

Five years of Title I, ESEA has had some effect on the administrative structure and the educational practices of the State Education Agency, Local Educational Agencies and non-public schools.

The State Education Agency has included in its organization both an office for the administration of Title I and an office for Federal-State Relations. The Title I office supervises and directs all the activities of Title I in the State, and the Division of Federal-State Relations is responsible for the coordination of a variety of Federal programs. The State Title I office works with the consultants in the special subject areas so that Title I activities become a part of the overall State program in a particular area. Coordination has been effected with other agencies in State Government which have an interest in the under-privileged child. Close working relationships have been established with the State Department of Health, the State Department of Welfare, and the State Board of Mental Health, the State Planning Task Force and with the regional commissions for the Appalachian area and for the Coastal Plains.

Most local education agencies have included in their administrative

structure a staff member whose main responsibility lies with Title I. Because of the establishment of such positions it has been necessary for steps to be taken to coordinate the Title I program with the other educational activities in the local unit. Much has been accomplished in effecting this coordination, but much remains to be done. In some instances, Title I tends to become a separate program and coordination with the overall educational program in the local unit has not been obtained. The State Title I office continues to call to the attention of local units the fact that Title I activities should be a part of the overall educational program.

In addition, the advent of Title I on the local level has made it necessary for local education agencies to effect coordination with other governmental and private agencies in their area. They have had to learn to work with the Health Department, the Welfare Department, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Model Cities Program, the Applachian Redevelopment Commission, the Coastal Plains Redevelopment Commission, the United Fund and with the non-public schools. This is an area in which much has been done, but in which much remains to be done. Coordination between all these agencies has not always been established and, in many instances where it has been established, it has not been effective. The State Title I office continues to work with local education agencies and with agencies outside the educational scene to improve this coordination and by this improvement to make the Title I activities much more effective.

Local educational agencies have identified the non-public schools operating in their area and have included the officials of these schools and the students who attend them in the planning, development, and implementation of Title I activities. The advent of Title I has made the officials

of the non-public school aware of the educational program in the public schools. Title I has and will continue to increase the cooperation between the public and non-public schools on the local level. This is again another area in which considerable improvement can take place and on which the State Title I office continues to work. The State Agency is doing all that it can at this time to promote cooperation between the public and non-public schools. Much closer cooperation has been effected in this area over the past four years, but much remains to be done so that the eligible children in all non-public schools will have the opportunity to participate actively in appropriate Title I activities.

Another area within the local school unit which has been affected by Title I is in the field of planning. Prior to the advent of Title I, many local education agencies had little or no activities directed toward planning for the future of their school programs. It was a neglected area as far as many school units were concerned. Therefore, the requirement in Title I for comprehensive planning has motivated many local education agencies to begin to make plans not only for Title I activities, but also for the overall educational programs in the respective units. Although the concept of planning is taking hold in many places, the very real fact of so many changes in Federal policy and the indefiniteness of Federal funding tends to retard the complete development of this important concept. It is impossible to do realistic planning when funds are made available so late or when the exact amount which will be available is never known until the middle of the fiscal year.

Further, the advent of the Title I program has made both State and local school administrators aware of the necessity for including all constituencies in the planning of effective educational programs. Advisory

committees on all levels have become common throughout the educational scene. Although these committees are not as widespread as they should be, they are growing in both number and importance.

6. Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged

A. If State funds have been used to augment Title I programs, describe the number of projects, objectives of the programs, rationale for increased funding with State money, and the amount and proportion of total program funds provided by the State for the 1968-69 school year.

No State funds have been used directly to augment the Title I program.

B. Provide descriptions of outstanding examples of the coordination of Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs. Identify the other programs and agencies involved.

Each LEA is required to include in its project proposal a description of how Title I activities were coordinated with other federally funded programs. Considerable progress has been made in this area, but there is still a need for continued improvement. Close coordination existed between Title I and Follow Through funded programs, Title I and activities funded under Titles II, III, and VI of ESEA, Titles III, and V-A of NDEA, the Vocational Education Act, U. S. Department of Agriculture Food Program, Community Action Agency, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and State Social and Welfare Agencies.

Excellent cooperation existed between Title I and the Follow Through Programs in Durham County, Goldsboro City, Guilford County, and Johnston County. The local directors and staff of each of these programs were cooperatively involved in planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the programs.

The following reports from LEAs illustrate examples of the coordination of Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs:

CASWELL COUNTY

Title I has worked closely with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, since its inception. NYC has provided enrollees for all Title I schools in both the regular program and summer programs. These enrollees have worked as bus driver aides, teacher aides, clerical aides, library aides, food service aides, and custodial aides. Headstart, another federally funded project, has been coordinated with Title I. There has been no duplication, but a continuation of services for educationally deprived students. For example, this past summer, Headstart and Title I operated three centers. Inservice for all personnel was sponsored jointly. An ESEA Title III research grant for developing curriculum for educable mentally retarded children has been planned in coordination with the Title I staff. All statistical data on students gathered by Title I staff will be shared and interpreted with Title III staff. Access to banks of test data and statistical information gathered by the Title I staff over the past three years has been provided for the staff of Title III. Continuation of rapport with other federally funded projects described in previous evaluations has been enjoyed.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Title I has coordinated activities with several federally funded programs in the following manner:

Title I and Title III (Psychological Services) are coordinating inservice education programs for the teachers in the Title I schools. The psychological staff is available for consultation with individual reading teachers regarding psychological needs of specific children etc., and, in turn, the reading teachers consult with teachers of children in the Title III (Special Instruction Classes) concerning specific reading

problems of these students.

The Title I staff consults frequently with the Sandhills Community Action Program, Inc. in regard to the analysis and planning for meeting the needs of the low-income children in Montgomery County.

Title I has entered a cooperative agreement with New Careers whereby five low-income personnel are provided college training (Sandhills Community College) and O. J. T. (Title I schools for future employment as Title I aides, provided funds are available.)

Sandhills Community Action Programs, Inc. sponsors the Headstart program which is coordinated with Title I and Title III summer programs. The same centers, lunchrooms, and school buses are used. The expenses are prorated on a per child basis among the three programs.

Title I reading teachers assist in the orientation program and have served as "buddy" teachers for the new teachers who qualified under the Education Professions Development Act.

Title I cooperated with PACE (Plan for Assuring College Education) by employing college students who were elementary education majors to serve as teacher aides in the summer reading program, etc.

GREENE COUNTY

The local administrative unit utilized funds from ESEA, Title II to provide library materials for the deprived students. NDEA funds enabled the unit to provide additional supplies and equipment for the schools. ESEA Title III, Preschool Development Program, served 60 deprived pre-school students in the county.

The Greene Lamp cooperated with Title I in meeting the needs of the deprived students through the PACE, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Headstart and New Careers Programs. During the 1969-70 school year, Greene Lamp,

under the New Careers Program, and Title I cooperated in providing five nurses aides for the schools. One half of their salary was financed under the New Careers Program and the other half under Title I. Greene Lamp's Emergency Food and Mental Program supplemented the food program with $15,000.00 for free lunches.

The Greene County Health Department provided supervision and direction for the ESEA health nurse. They utilized the available resources of the county in an effort to meet the basic physical needs of the deprived children.

The Greene County Department of Social Services worked with the families of some of these students and assisted some of the students in correcting defects. Psychological examinations were administered to some of the qualifying students through this department.

MACON COUNTY

Title III ESEA: Eight counties in this area are funded for the Smoky Mountain Cultural Arts Developmental Association which operates through Jackson County. SMCADA furnishes music and art teachers in the schools to help teachers plan and operate in these fields.

OEO operates six (6) centers for pupils in Year-Round Day Care. We plan with them on recruitment so there will be no competition for pupils nor duplication of effort being made for deprived pupils.

Teacher Corps: During FY - '69 Cycle II and Cycle III operated in the schools with the employment of two (2) team leaders who have M. A. Degrees and eleven (11) interns who worked in four elementary schools. Their work greatly complimented the Title I activities. Teacher Corps and Title I are primarily concerned with the educationally deprived and it is felt that the coordination of their joint efforts were very effective.

For FY '70 there were three (3) cycle IV Teacher Corps Teams in the schools in addition to the second year of Cycle III.

7. Evaluate the success of Title I in bringing compensatory education to children enrolled in non-public schools. Include in your evaluation such factors as the number of projects, the quality of projects, the time of day and/or year when projects are offered, the adaptations to meet the specific educational needs of educationally deprived children in non-public schools, changes in legal interpretation, and joint planning with non-public school officials.

Many non-public schools in North Carolina have few or no participants in local Title I projects due to the fact that (1) they have few children who can be classified as economically or educationally deprived, or (2) they are not in compliance with the guidelines of the Department of Health Education and Welfare under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Twenty LEAs had a total of 1462 non-public school children participating in their Title I program activities during FY 1970. Sixteen LEAs had from 6-50 non-public participants and four LEA had from 54-694 non-public school participants. Charlotte-Mecklenburg had 694 non-public school children participating in its Title I program which accounts for 47.5 percent of the total non-public school participants in Title I programs in North Carolina for FY 1970.

The assessment of needs, the selection of priority of needs, and the selection of activities to meet the needs of eligible non-public school children were decided jointly by the administration of non-public schools and the administration of public schools. In making provisions for these children to participate in meaningful activities, directors and superintendents of public schools held conferences with officials of non-public schools. In addition to these conferences the administration of public schools made telephone calls and wrote letters to non-public school officials informing them of the services available to their children through Title I

programs.

To meet the most pressing needs of educationally deprived children in non-public schools, LEAs loaned varying types and levels of instructional materials and equipment to non-public schools. In order to see that materials and equipment were on hand for these children when needed, LEAs delivered them on a scheduled basis.

In some instances Title I Art and Reading teachers in the public schools scheduled themselves daily and weekly to teach children in the non-public schools individually and in small groups.

Supportive services these children received through the Title I program were in the areas of Welfare services, Medical and Dental services, Social services, and Food.

In Gaston County, working relations between the two non-public schools and the public schools have always been excellent. The quality of services the non-public schools receive is the same as that extended to the public schools. These services are offered to non-public schools and public schools at the same time. The degree of participation in Title I services by non-public schools has always depended upon the special needs of their educationally deprived children and the type of service being offered. Joint planning assures optimum participation.

Students from non-public schools received benefits from the following Title I services:

1. Summer reading programs
2. Audio Visual materials
3. Testing programs

Non-public school participants in Greenville, N. C. received direct benefit from Title I expenditures through the use of skill - building

instructional materials. The language arts area was enhanced by these materials. The degree of joint planning for the utilization of Title I funds was to the extent that non-public school officials submitted an analysis of needs of their children. Cooperatively with non-public school officials, the Title I office was able to plan an activity to assist in meeting their needs.

8. How many LEAs conducted coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs for education aides and professional staff members they assist? What was the total number of participants in each project? Describe the general patterns of activities and provide specific examples of outstanding joint training programs.

Based upon data reported in the Preliminary Evaluation Reports submitted by LEAs to the State Title I Office, 25 LEAs provided coordinated inservice programs for teachers and aides. Participants in coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs included 1957 teachers, 609 aides, and 188 other participants. Several LEAs reported that inservice programs were conducted separately for teachers and aides. LEAs which reported inservice programs only for teachers or only for aides were not included in the above count. Some of the LEAs reported that the inservice programs were primarily orientation sessions for teachers and aides to meet each other and to make general plans for initiating the project or special activities. A variety of personnel were engaged by the LEAs to conduct their inservice programs for aides and teachers. Many brought in outside consultants from other school districts, from the State Department of Public Instruction and from colleges and universities.

Inservice training topics reported by LEAs included - Working With the Disadvantaged, Use of Tests, Reading, Early Childhood Education, Child Development, Individualized Instruction, Use of Instructional Materials, Handling Confidential Information, Use of A. V. Equipment, and Clerical

Work in the Instructional Program. These topics were explored through workshops, demonstrations, lectures, committee work, and research.

Examples of Joint Training Programs:

CASWELL COUNTY

Inservice education for Title I personnel was more intensive and involved more people than previous projects. The inservice education program involved teacher and the aides with whom they would work during the next school year.

The first two-week session was held July 20-31 from 8:30 till 12:30 daily. Thirty-five teachers and six teacher aides examined techniques of relating communication skills through science.

The second phase of inservice education was sponsored jointly with an ESEA Title III project. This was held August 10-21 with eight teachers and eight teacher aides. These sixteen Title I people joined eight teachers and aides from Title III in a study of writing behavioral objectives for disadvantaged students.

The third phase of the inservice education program was Health and Nutritional needs for the Disadvantaged lasted from August 3-21. In this institute three paid consultants worked with three consultants obtained from cooperating agencies at no cost to Title I.

Nine teachers, nine teacher aides, and fifteen others (including several parents) discussed such problems as home-school relationships, proper diet, the need for proper medical care, and made recommendations as to what Title I personnel might do to provide answers to these problems.

WASHINGTON COUNTY

The Title I inservice training program was designed for teachers and aides who participated in the summer reading program. The workshop

enabled teachers to become familiar with new reading techniques and materials. The title of the workshop was "Improvement of Reading Instruction."

The instructor for this workshop is a member of the faculty at East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina.

Fifteen hours were spent for formal instruction and six hours for laboratory experiences. Each teacher was to have written evaluations of the child she worked with in the workshop. A written evaluation of the total program was required.

Participants in the workshop included 2 supervisors, 34 teachers, and 34 aides.

Effort was made to coordinate in-service program for education aides and professional staff members they assisted.

LENOIR COUNTY

The audiovisual workshop consisted of eighteen (18) contact hours with fifty-one participants divided into four groups. The primary objective was to train participants in the production of materials to be used with individuals and small groups. Aides worked with the professional staff. They assisted in their schools in the workshops. Such activities as the following were covered:

1. Camera Techniques
2. Audio tape recording
3. Preparation of transparency masters
4. Dry Mounting and Picture Lift

The following is a breakdown of the participants and their categories:

Administrators	0
Supervisors	1

Teachers	24
Aides	23
Principals	1
Librarians	2

9. Describe the nature and extent of community and parent involvement in your Title I project. If you have a Title I Advisory Committee, briefly describe contributions made by the group. Indicate also the make-up or composition of your Advisory Committee.

The primary goal for the participation of parents in Title I program activities in North Carolina is to build the capabilities of parents to work with the school in a way which supports their children's well-being, growth, and development.

In order to encourage and see that LEAs include opportunities for community and parent involvement in Title I programs, the SEA provides each LEA with a copy of "Criteria for the Approval of Applications for Grants under Title I, ESEA," and informs them of their responsibility for involving parents and the community in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of these programs.

There are 152 LEAs in North Carolina. All of them involved the community and parents in their 1970 Title I programs in varying degrees, and a variety of ways to make the programs more effective for children.

A review of the 1970 evaluation reports submitted by LEAs to the SEA indicates that parents and the community were involved in nearly all aspects of Title I program activities from project planning to project evaluation.

A summary of responses of these reports shows that the parents and community were involved in Title I projects as follows:

- Observed Title I reading and kindergarten classes.
- Chaperoned children on field trips.
- Supervised lunch periods.

- Participated in workshops on "Home Improvement," and "How Parents Can Help Children Succeed In School."
- Served as teacher aides, library aides, clerical aides, resource persons for instructional units, and on Advisory Committees.
- Held conferences with teachers and principals, school nurses, and social workers.
- Assisted with the registration of pupils and the conducting of community surveys.
- Gave tutorial services for children who needed remedial instruction in reading.
- Assisted with the planning, implementation and evaluation of Title I program activities.
- Gave parties for deprived children.
- Provided transportation in some instances to take children on field trips and to medical and dental appointments.

Two examples of parent and community involvement in Title I projects at the local level follow:

BUNCOMBE COUNTY

Many efforts were expended to involve several individuals and groups in assessing the needs of educationally deprived children in the 1970 Title I program. A functional Advisory Committee of 60 members, composed of parents, teachers, principals, counselors, librarians, and representatives of cooperating agencies having a genuine and continuing interest in such children, was organized. More than 50 percent of the membership of the committee consisted of parents of disadvantaged children.

This committee held many meetings and made the following contributions to the Title I program:

1. Determined the scope and extent of services that would be rendered by each agency in order to avoid repetition of services.
2. Assisted in planning, implementing, and evaluating the program activities.

DURHAM CITY

In the reading and kindergarten programs the Title I staff worked toward promoting a more effective, cooperative, home-school relationship. This was accomplished in part through home visits, conferences with principals, teachers, and social workers. Working exclusively with the teachers, children, and parents in the kindergarten program, the social worker in her capacity as a resource person to the kindergarten teachers furthered significantly the goals of parental involvement and helped to prevent problems which might have hampered the child's response to the instructional program. In screening applicants for the kindergarten class, we initially gave information in local newspapers concerning the qualifying of children. In addition, the principals sent letters to homes in which they felt were likely participants. Subsequently, a close liaison was established between school and home. This was followed up by having the parents involved in the daily classroom activities and taking part in the general evaluation of the program.

The local Advisory Committee was composed of twenty-five members. Represented in this group were six persons from the school administrative staff, thirteen parents from target schools, and two members from the local parochial school. In addition, community agencies represented were the Experimental Parallel Organization, ACT, Operation Breakthrough (Community Development), and United Organizations for Community Improvement.

At a meeting held in different schools monthly, various Title I staff members spoke to groups concerning relative objectives of the program and

suggested ways in which the communities and parents should be involved. In addition, they were given opportunities to express opinions concerning the program and to make recommendations relative to possible changes.